

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARK A. PANOWICZ

v.

SHARON L. HANCOCK

:

:

: Civil Action No. DKC 11-2417

:

:

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff Mark A. Panowicz has filed yet another motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 122). In this one, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the court's April 28, 2023, memorandum and order denying his four motions for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60. (ECF Nos. 120, 121). The court now rules, no hearing being deemed necessary. Local Rule 105.6.

Plaintiff styles his motion as a motion for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). However, Rule 59(e) governs motions "to alter or amend a judgment," and a denial of a Rule 60 motion is not a judgment. This court's local rules allow for the filing of motions for reconsideration of other orders within fourteen days of the entry of the order. Local Rule 105.10. Plaintiff's motion was filed beyond that deadline on May 26, 2023.

In any event, Plaintiff's motion does not contain any valid grounds for reconsideration. A motion for reconsideration "may not be used merely to reiterate arguments previously rejected by

the court," *Innes v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. Sys. of Md.*, 121 F.Supp.3d 504, 507 (D.Md. 2015), nor may it be used "to advance new arguments not previously articulated with clarity after those that were made have been rejected," *Carrero v. Farrelly*, No. 16-cv-3939-JKB, 2018 WL 1761957, at *2 (D.Md. Apr. 12, 2018). Plaintiff's motion merely rehashes and reframes arguments previously rejected in an effort to persuade the court to change its mind. The motion identifies no clear errors in the court's prior ruling or new evidence that would warrant reconsideration. Plaintiff's motion will be denied.

A separate order will follow.

/s/
DEBORAH K. CHASANOW
United States District Judge